

Daniel De Leon

THE STRUGGLE
AGAINST OPPORTUNISM IN
THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

By L. G. RAISKY

Professor, Department of History
Leningrad University

PRICE 20 CENTS

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY
45 Rose Street, New York City

Daniel De Leon

THE STRUGGLE
AGAINST OPPORTUNISM IN
THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

By L. G. RAISKY

Professor, Department of History
Leningrad University

DANIEL DE LEON

The Struggle Against Opportunism
in the American Labor Movement

By L. G. Raisky

*Professor Department of History,
Leningrad University.*

A brief sketch of the activities and theories of Daniel De Leon in relation to the American labor movement by a Russian who, despite the disadvantages of his viewing De Leon's work from the standpoint of an industrially backward country, succeeds far better than the average European in appraising the subject of his sketch.

With critical annotations, footnotes and an appendix by the present publishers.

48 pp.—Price 20c.

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS CO.
45 Rose St., New York City

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY

45 Rose Street, New York City

1932

345464

FOREWORD.

In the following pages is presented a translation by one Povsner of L. G. Raisky's essay, "Daniel De Leon and the Struggle Against Opportunism in the American Labor Movement." Raisky is (or was at the time) professor at Leningrad University, Department of History. It appeared originally in the *Communist*, a magazine published by the American Anarcho-Communist group, issues of September and October 1930. The essay was considered to be one of the best coming from European quarters, so good that the Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE, official organ of the Socialist Labor Party, decided to reprint it. Before doing so, however, efforts were made to check up on the translation, experience having demonstrated that no reliance could be placed in the honesty or disinterestedness of the Anarcho-Communists. Through the courtesy of Professor Raisky himself (with whom the National Secretary of the Socialist Labor Party had previously corresponded) a copy of the original Russian edition was secured. Comrade M. Kowarsky of Section Kings County, Socialist Labor Party, who is thoroughly conversant with Russian, compared the Russian very carefully with the *Communist* version, and on the whole only minor errors were discovered which have been corrected. But of greater importance than the incidental errors and crudi-

ties is the fact that several paragraphs dealing specifically with the Socialist Labor Party and its relation to trade unionism were deliberately suppressed, whether by the translator or by the publishers matters not. These deletions have been indicated by embracing them in brackets, and they may be found on page 19. The fact of these expurgations adds renewed force to the contention of the Socialist Labor Party that it is the intended victim of a conspiracy of silence in which (in common recognition of the fact that the S. L. P. stands on the working class side of the class struggle line, with all the other groups on the other side) are joined in fraternal fellowship the old capitalist parties, the labor fakers, the bourgeois-liberal "Socialist party," the Anarcho-Communist party and its offshoots and subsidiaries. Despite differences among themselves, these groups act as *one* in their hatred and fear of the Socialist Labor Party. This "community of interest" in opposing the Marxian Socialist Labor Party has perhaps been best expressed by Wm. J. Ghent, former member of the Socialist party, at one time one of that Party's chief formulators of principles and policies, and who was secretary to the late Social Democratic politician Victor L. Berger when the latter served in the U. S. Congress. Said Ghent:

14 Apr 33 Bureau + Noble 20 Economics

"If there is, so far as I am acquainted with the situation, one common attitude among all these warring groups, it is that the Socialist Labor Party and every one connected with it is to be ignored."

Neither the out-and-out capitalist nor his agents (conscious or otherwise) have as yet learned that the ostrich act can fool none but the tribe of ostriches, including, as we have seen here, the Anarcho-Communist ostrich.

Wherever necessary, corrections and dissenting views have been re-

corded in footnotes. Mr. Raisky's own footnotes are indicated by the initials "L. R." Ours are clearly indicated by the signature "Publishers." In addition, we are printing an appendix prepared by the Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE and the National Secretary of the Socialist Labor Party. With these corrections and exceptions this work is commended to the readers as one of the fairest and (within its limits) best appraisals of De Leon that so far has emanated from non-Socialist Labor Party sources.

ARNOLD PETERSEN.

January 1932.

DANIEL DE LEON

1.

At the end of the second third of the past century Karl Marx wrote, not without good reason, that the United States was a European colony. But how radically and with what unheard of speed has the situation changed! Already at the beginning of the '90's the United States, by the scale of its industrial production, firmly assumed the first place among the capitalist countries of the world, leaving far behind not only Germany and France, but also the "world's workshop," England.

The character and structure of American capitalism changed radically. A noticeable development of monopoly capital in the United States had already begun in the '80's. In 1879 Rockefeller founded the oil trust which was reorganized in 1882 along modern lines. Five years later a sugar trust, embracing twenty-one factories, was established. The victorious march of monopoly capital led to dismay among the middle and petty bourgeoisie who attempted to build a legal dam against the approaching "disaster." But the Sherman law which was adopted by Congress in 1890 proved to be impotent in the struggle against the mighty economic elements: the growth of monopoly of capital was not stopped. Furthermore, it easily broke through the weak judicial barriers

and confidently, irresistibly swamped the economic life of the country.

Where was the government at the time? How did it react to this attitude of the capitalists toward the Sherman law? What did the government do to combat the endless violations of this notorious law? It closed its eyes upon these "frolics" of the plutocracy. Moreover, it actively helped the bourgeoisie to evade the laws which were issued in order to hoodwink the voters. The only real effect of the Sherman law was its unexpected interpretation by the Supreme Court in the sense that trade unions are organizations violating the "freedom of labor" and therefore non-constitutional.

After firmly capturing the decisive economic and political positions within the country, finance capital of the United States appeared in the '90's on the world arena. In a chase for South American and Far Eastern markets, American imperialism took up with great vim the work of conquering the commanding heights of the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean. As early as 1898, the United States virtually annexed the Hawaiian Islands. In 1898 American imperialism provoked a war with Spain, quickly and thoroughly defeating that country and annexing the Philippine Islands, Guam, Porto Rico, and establishing its protectorate over Cuba.

"Irresistible economic forces drive us toward the domination of the world!" By these words Senator Lodge formulated on the eve of the twentieth century the program of the youthful and avaricious American imperialism.

The United States was converted into a classic country of capitalist monopoly and imperialism.

II.

The sharp changes which developed in the social and economic life of the United States produced new conditions for, and a new character in the labor movement.

In the latter half of the '80's the power and influence of the Knights of Labor, the mass organization of the unskilled workers, reached its apex. Contrary to the position of the leaders who intended to solve the labor problem by mutual aid and peaceful cooperative development, the workers threw themselves into stormy strike struggle. This was a period of sharp class battles. The labor aristocracy took an extremely hostile attitude towards the struggle of the unskilled workers; they reacted with even greater enmity towards the attempt of the Knights of Labor to gain control over the unions of skilled workers. And when the bourgeoisie resorted to lockouts, blacklists and police terror in order to crush the Knights of Labor, the trade unions assumed an attitude of friendly neutrality, and sometimes even of active assistance to the bourgeoisie. By the united efforts of the capitalists, the government and the trade unions of the skilled workers,

the Knights of Labor was suppressed at the end of the '80's, and in the '90's its remnants, which had lost the support of the masses, became converted into reactionary utopian groups that stewed in their own juice. The master of the situation from then on was the American Federation of Labor, the organization of the skilled workers.

After having been finally established in 1886, the American Federation of Labor, led by Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell, Strasser and others, at first flirted, though very platonically, with Socialism, but soon forgot its youthful infatuation.

At the basis of its theory and practice the American Federation of Labor laid down the following series of principles:

1. The recognition of the indestructibility of capitalism. The struggle for the every-day interests of the trade union members within the framework of existing society.

At the end of the nineteenth century the unoccupied land in the United States had been practically exhausted and the workingman was no longer able to take up farming and become a property owner. How did the leaders of the American Federation of Labor react to this new situation? "The wage worker has now reconciled himself to the fact that he must remain a wage worker to the end of his life," wrote John Mitchell, the vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, at the beginning of the twentieth century. "He has abandoned the hope for the future state in which he would become a capitalist (why necessarily a capitalist and not a member of the Socialist Commonwealth?—L. R.) so that his aspira-

tions are limited to the desire that he as a worker should receive a compensation commensurable with his work." Fair pay for a fair day's work—this formula expressed the entire concern of the trade union chiefs.

Replying to unjust charges of support of Socialist theories, advanced against the American Federation of Labor by Professor Laughlin, Gompers wrote in the official organ of the Federation: "The unions have supported no other theory except the one which says that labor is entitled to reasonable pay, a reasonable working day and human conditions of labor.... The literature of the trade unions is not socialistic. Ask the Socialist leaders."

2. Class cooperation. "Hostility between labor and capital is not a necessity," Mitchell's argument continues. "The one cannot exist without the other. Capital is accumulated and materialized work, while the ability to work is a form of capital. There is even no necessary contrast of principle between the worker and the capitalist. Both are men with human virtues and vices, and both strive to receive more than their just share. But upon a closer examination the interest of the one appears to be the interest of the other, and welfare of the one the welfare of the other." Mitchell saw the purpose of his book as that of convincing the capitalists to treat the workers "as tolerantly and decently as the latter treat them."

Following the principle of class cooperation, Gompers and Mitchell joined in 1901 the American Civic Federation, a *capitalist body officially* designated to settle disputes between labor and capital, while in

reality organized for the purpose of fighting the revolutionary labor movement. Gompers and Mitchell received from the American Civic Federation six thousand dollars per year each. Gompers was very proud of his official connection with the Civic Federation and always emphasized his full title: "President of the American Federation of Labor and Vice-President of the American Civic Federation."

3. Purely economic methods of struggle. "What must be cured—the economic, social or political life?" Gompers asks in the *American Federationist* in September, 1902. "If the economic life is to be cured it must be done by economic and not by any other methods." To be sure, the American Federation of Labor was by no means non-political; it merely opposed the independent political labor movement, preferring to make election agreements with this or that capitalist party and secure pledges to defend trade union interests in Congress (on the principle of "Punish your enemies and reward your friends.")

4. The craft principle of organization. Every craft had its union. Paragraph 2 of the constitution of the Federation provided for "the foundation of national and international unions, strictly observing the autonomy of each trade, and facilitating the development and consolidation of similar organizations."

5. High initiation and membership fees. In January, 1900, Gompers wrote a complete treatise in an attempt "to prove by all means the fatal results of the non-establishment of high dues and proper revenues." The system of high dues had a double object. Firstly, it helped to

create immense funds which were used for relief and insurance purposes; secondly, with their aid the trade unions firmly closed their doors to the poorly paid workers, this unruly element which constantly disturbed the principle of brotherhood between labor and capital, and dragged the trade unions into strikes which exhausted trade union funds.

6. The struggle against colored workers, who tended to degrade the standard of living of white American workers; the consolidation of the privileged position of the white Americans.

By this policy the leaders of the American Federation of Labor arrived at a situation in which ninety per cent of the workers remained outside the labor organizations and completely at the mercy of capitalist exploitation. But what are the sufferings of the vast masses of the workers to the Gomperses? They were perfectly indifferent to the contempt and hatred with which the revolutionary workers regarded them. But what pride Gompers took in the praise which the capitalists showered upon the craft unions and their leaders!

"For ten years I bitterly fought organized labor," Gompers quotes Potter Palmer. "It cost me a good deal over a million dollars to learn that there is no more skilful, brainy, devoted work than the one which is governed by an organization whose officials are level-headed men with the same standard...."

Melville E. Engels, the chairman of the board of directors of four great railroads, said, "It seems to me that your trade agreement offers

the same protection to capital as to labor."

Senator Mark A. Hanna, capitalist and politician, said, "Organize for no other purpose than for the mutual benefit of the employer and worker; do not organize in the spirit of antagonism.... I found the labor organizations prepared and willing to meet us more than half way." The same Hanna called the leaders of the craft unions "lieutenants of the captains of industry."

It was under these conditions that De Leon developed his activity.

III.

Daniel De Leon was born in Venezuela on December 14, 1852, and was the son of a prosperous doctor. He was educated in Europe (Germany and Holland), where he studied modern and ancient languages, history, philosophy and mathematics. At the age of twenty De Leon graduated from the university and soon went to the United States where he engaged in teaching and writing. In New York, De Leon enrolled in Columbia University, where he studied law. Upon graduating from the university he acted for six years as assistant professor of international law in the same college. De Leon's academic career began brilliantly, thanks to his extensive and international education and oratorical gifts. He became very popular among the students and with the university administration, and was soon to gain the chair of full professor.

But this academic career ended just as dramatically as it began. In the middle of the '80's De Leon be-

came closely interested in the labor and Socialist movement. In 1888 he joined the Knights of Labor and later fell under the influence of the American utopian, Edward Bellamy. Soon, however, the utopian reform movement ceased to satisfy De Leon, who made a thorough and serious study of Marxism in which he found the answer to all the social problems which interested him.

The university administration then began to give attention to the fact that De Leon's lectures were becoming imbued with Socialist ideas. A conversation followed between De Leon and the president of the university, and when the latter began to explain to De Leon that science was neutral and apolitical, De Leon at once submitted his resignation.*

From that time on De Leon completely broke with university circles and devoted himself entirely to the labor movement, placing all of his unusual gifts at its service.

In 1890 De Leon joined the Socialist Labor Party which adhered to a Marxian position, and thanks to

his extensive learning, will power, fanatical devotion to the working class, and oratorical and literary gifts, he soon gained a leading position in this party. Thenceforth the history of the Socialist Labor Party became inseparable from the political biography of Daniel De Leon, just as the history of the C.P.S.U. is closely connected with the name of Lenin.

In a brief sketch it is impossible, of course, to describe the entire twenty-five years of De Leon's Socialist work, just as it is impossible in such a short space to give a full idea of his theory of "industrialism," which constitutes a retreat from Marxism in the direction of syndicalism,** or, of his theory of the State, in which De Leon, one year before the first Russian Revolution, anticipated some elements of the Soviet system. We will also have to pass by the weak points of De Leon's policy which suffered from the spirit of sectarianism. [This sounds curious, coming from an adherent of that "ultra-sectarian," Lenin.—*Publishers.*] In this article

*"Daniel De Leon held a prize lectureship at Columbia University for two successive terms, 1883-1889. The lectureship was in the Department of International Law, during which time he was a member of the faculty of the School of Political Science of the University, the applicants for their degrees having to pass examination before him also in his branch. The remuneration was \$25 for each of twenty lectures to be delivered in one term—three months. He was not dismissed, nor dropped. He left at the expiration of his second term because he did not care to continue in the same position, as was proposed to him, but demanded the permanent position of full professor, as had been promised him, but which was withheld on the ground of his joining the labor movement in 1886."—From Letter Box answer by De Leon, *Daily People*, Oct. 9, 1904.

**It is preposterous of Professor Raisky to claim that De Leon's "theory of 'industrialism' constitutes a retreat from Marxism in the direction of syndicalism." Industrialism, or to put it correctly, Industrial Unionism is implicit in Marxism, so implicit, indeed, that to have omitted it as the central feature of the Socialist movement in America would have constituted "a retreat from Marxism," with social reformism and Gompersism as the inevitable alternative. For just as Gompersism is the logical concomitant of petty bourgeois reformism, so Industrial Unionism constitutes the crowning climax,

we will limit ourselves to a description of De Leon's resolute and difficult struggle against opportunism in the country of "classic" opportunism, in the country of the most backward labor movement.

American capitalism had a number of important advantages over the European capitalist countries. Possessing an abundance of raw materials and cheap fuel, the American bourgeoisie was able to develop a peculiarly American rate of capital accumulation. This was so also because the entire globe constantly supplied it with labor power. The United States did not have to make any outlays for the training of skilled labor, as the European capitalist countries were forced to do, but largely received this labor from outside. In addition, owing to the presence of vast unoccupied stretches of land in the country, there was practically no absolute ground rent and the bourgeoisie was not forced to divide the surplus value with the landlords; thus the American employers were richer than their European rivals.

The United States is one of the youngest capitalist countries and therefore made use of all the latest technical appliances. The American bourgeoisie was impelled constantly to improve the technic of production by the high price of labor. With the aid of the most modern machinery

and the speed-up system the American capitalists squeezed out of the workers more surplus value than European capitalists. Two American workers produced as much as five British. Upon establishing a monopoly within the country, the American capitalists protected the domestic market from foreign competition by a system of high tariffs and converted the vast country into a field of monopoly super-profit.

All this enabled the American bourgeoisie to place the workers in better conditions than those prevailing in Europe. In the United States the highest wages have been historically established. Without this condition the bourgeoisie would not have been able to keep the necessary number of workers in the industrial centers, in the factories, mines and railways. The presence of free land made itself strongly felt.

But if the American proletariat represented a peculiar aristocracy compared with the workers in other lands, among the American proletariat itself there grew up a section of highly skilled workers (chiefly Americans) whom the bourgeoisie placed in specially privileged conditions and who broke away from the rest of the working masses. It was this labor aristocracy which supplied the basis for Gompersism.

The awakening of the classconsciousness of the American workers

the very efflorescence of revolutionary Marxism. It is, in fact, the form "at last discovered under which [in ultra-capitalist countries] to work out the economic emancipation of labor." (Marx.) Moreover, in stigmatizing De Leon's Industrial Union theory as a retreat from Marxism, Rasky must accept the logic of his contention by including Lenin as one who also "retreated" from Marxism, for it was Lenin who recognized De Leon's Industrial Union and Industrial Government theory as the only contribution to Marxian thought, adding: "Industrial Unionism is the basic thing, that is what we are building."—*Publishers*.

was also hindered by the following factors. The country had a considerable amount of free land which served as a refuge to the unemployed and discontented workers. True, by the end of the nineteenth century there was practically no free land left, but its existence in the past left a definite impress upon the psychology of the American proletariat.

The same effect was exercised by the democratic system of government and the competition between the two political parties. In the chase for votes both of these rival parties made some concessions to the workers and corrupted their consciousness. Finally, the ethnographic diversity of the American proletariat also had its effect. The American born white workers enjoyed better conditions compared with not only the Negroes, Chinese and other colored workers, but also the white foreign-born workers. In this way the bourgeoisie strove to imbue the white American workers with a belief in the identity of the national interests of all Americans as opposed to those of all other races and nations.

In consequence of all of these factors the American labor movement became more backward, conservative and opportunistic than labor in Europe. In the United States there has historically developed a sharp contrast between the objective maturity of the country for Socialism and the backwardness of the subjective factor.

IV.

In his theoretical and practical activities De Leon proceeded on the belief that the Socialist revolution

must begin in the United States, the country of classic capitalism, where the absence of any elements of feudalism has resulted in the highest type of capitalist relations, and where, therefore, the objective conditions for the Socialist revolution were more ripe than in any other capitalist country.

If this is so, then it is necessary to use all forces for the preparation of the subjective factor. It is necessary to awaken the classconsciousness of the proletariat, to organize it on an economic and political basis, and lead it to a strong attack on the capitalist fortress. This makes it necessary, first of all, to rearrange the forces of the Party, this "head of the lance," this "head of the column."

"In all revolutionary movement," De Leon said in his address "Reform or Revolution," in January, 1896, "as in the storming of fortresses, the thing depends upon the head of the column—upon that minority that is so intense in its convictions, so soundly based on its principles, so determined in its action, that it carries the masses with it, storms the breastworks and captures the fort. Such a head of the column must be our Socialist organization to the whole column of the American proletariat. . . . The army that is to conquer it is the army of the proletariat, the head of whose column must consist of the intrepid Socialist organization that has earned their love, their respect, their confidence."

In the social cataclysm which is inevitable in the near future, all the petty bourgeois and reformist organizations will be swept away under the debris of the old world. Only

the stalwart Socialist [Labor] Party will firmly stand over the ruins; it alone will be capable of leading the masses, "but only upon revolutionary lines can it achieve this; upon lines of reform it can never be victorious."

De Leon proclaimed a merciless war upon reformism. Reforms, he said, mark a change of the outer forms only, while the inner substance remains unchanged. A poodle may be shorn to look like a lion, but it still remains a dog. Yet the wealthy and powerful American bourgeoisie has fully appreciated the demoralizing force of concessions and sops, while the capitalist politicians know the power of reform which serves as a safety valve, giving vent to the revolutionary sentiments of the workers, and as a trap into which the reformists are easily enticed by the bait.

De Leon considered it a "fatal illusion" to hold that capitalism can be gradually destroyed with the aid of palliatives. The tiger will defend the tips of his mustache with the same ferocity that he will defend his very heart. This is an instinctive process. A sop is an "opiate prescribed for appeasement." "The revolutionist," De Leon wrote in his remarkable work, "Two Pages from Roman History" (April, 1902), "must never throw sops at the revolutionary element. The instant he does, he places himself at the mercy of the foe; he can always be out-sopped. And so was Gaius Gracchus. The proposition for twelve colonies with which the patriciate answered Gaius's proposition for three, completely neutralized the latter, leaving the 'honors' on the side of the patriciate. Nursed at

the teat of the sop, the Roman proletariat decamped to where they could get the largest quantities of that commodity. And that, more than any other thing, stripped Gaius of his forces. Once he was deserted and downed, the bigger sop of twelve colonies never materialized. It had answered its narcotic purpose, and was dropped."

As a striking example of blindness displayed by reformists, De Leon cited the telegram received by the *Milwaukee Social Democratic Herald* from Chicago on April 2, 1902: "Two-thirds majority cast for municipal ownership," the telegram read, "shows that Socialism is in the air."

The labor movement in Chicago gained considerable force; the soil there was ploughed up deeper than in New York, De Leon says; probably for this reason the capitalist politicians of Chicago were more "skilful" and "mobile" even than their New York colleagues. But even in New York individual politicians resorted to the "municipal ownership" plank for the purpose of camouflage.

"Unterrified Socialist agitation has familiarized the public mind with Socialist aspirations, though still only in a vague way. The politician, being 'broad' besides 'quick,' has no objection to polling 'Socialistic' votes. Being 'quick' besides 'broad,' he has no objection to the performance if he can indulge in it by giving the shadow for the substance; all the less if he can thereby run Socialism into the ground. 'Municipal ownership' lends itself peculiarly to such purposes. It sounds 'Socialistic'; and yet we know the term can conceal the archest anti-

labor scheme. His nursery-tale theory concerning his God-given capacity to run industries having suffered shipwreck, the capitalist can find a snug harbor of refuge in 'municipal ownership.' It is an ideal capitalist sop to catch the sopable. . . . And yet this Social Democrat rejoices: 'Two-thirds majority cast for municipal ownership shows that Socialism is in the air.'

"'In the air!'" De Leon mockingly agrees. "Very much 'in the air'—everywhere, except on Chicago soil."

Any sop thrown by a reformist to the proletariat is like the skin of a banana placed under the feet of the proletariat, which will cause it to slip and fall. "Not sops, but the unconditional surrender of capitalism, is the battle-cry of the Proletarian Revolution."

V.

Up to the '90's the Socialist Labor Party developed very slowly, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The party consisted almost exclusively of foreigners, particularly Germans. It was characteristic that the central organ of the party was published not in English, but in German. The influence of the party among the American born workers was extremely weak.

Ideologically, the party was only beginning to get on its feet. Only in 1889 was the demand for the material assistance of the workers' associations by the State omitted from the program, a demand which was copied from the German Lassallians or, to be more exact, imported into America by the German immigrants. On the fundamental ques-

tion confronting the party, namely, the question of the methods and platforms by which it could entrench itself in American soil and pave the way to the masses of native workers, two tendencies fought each other. One believed that it was necessary to give the main attention to Socialist propaganda during elections, ignoring the trade union movement; the other saw the principal task of the party in the trade union movement, and neglected the political activity.

De Leon opened a struggle against these narrow, anti-Marxian tendencies, insisting that the economic and political struggle must be conducted simultaneously.

Under De Leon the central organ of the party for the first time began to be published in English, first as a weekly (*The People*) and nine years later as a daily and a weekly (*The Daily People* and the *Weekly People*). The newspaper was written not only for the workers but in a considerable measure also by the workers whom De Leon, as editor, attracted as correspondents. With the aid of the newspaper ably edited by De Leon, the party battered its way to the bulk of the American proletariat, educating and organizing its advance guard.

The triumph of imperialism, the taking up of the offensive against the masses of the proletariat by the monopolistic plutocracy created a favorable basis for an extension of the Socialist movement in the United States. In the '90's the party, led by De Leon, entered on the broad historical highway.

However, the new conditions gave rise to new difficulties. De Leon's determination to convert the party

into a revolutionary militant vanguard of the proletariat met with resistance within the party, which led at the end of the century to a split and a segregation between the revolutionary and opportunist elements in American Socialism. During 1900-1901 the elements who were dissatisfied with the inner-party regime and the tactical principles defended by De Leon, constituted themselves into a new Socialist party. At the head of this party were Morris Hillquit, Victor Berger and others.

Originally, the differences between De Leon's followers and the supporters of Hillquit and Berger were caused by inner-party questions and the attitude to be taken toward the trade unions. During the twentieth century the two parties drifted further and further apart, each of them developing its own conception of the structure of the future society, of the main roads leading to Socialism, and the effect of parliamentarism.

VI.

Hillquit, one of the representatives of the anti-De Leonist wing of the Socialist Labor Party, who subsequently became the head of the Socialist party, constantly complained about "the fanatical severity (of De Leon) in the enforcement of discipline."

Indeed, De Leon was absolutely unrelenting in the struggle against intellectualist individualism and in the fight for proletarian discipline. This logically followed from De Leon's entire revolutionary position. If modern America is a battlefield, if the proletariat is one of

the armies acting in this field, then the vanguard of the revolutionary class will solve its historical mission only if it enters the battle in full fighting readiness.

A comparison between De Leon and Lenin naturally presents itself to one's mind. De Leon's views on the inner-party question resemble Lenin's even in the style in which they are expressed.

In his "Reform or Revolution," which we have already cited, De Leon draws the following parallel between a revolutionist and a reformist:

"The modern revolutionist, i.e., the Socialist, must, in the first place, by reason of the sketch I presented to you, upon the development of the State, necessarily work in organization, with all that that implies. In this you have the first characteristic that distinguishes the revolutionist from the reformer; the reformer spurns organization; his symbol is 'Five Sore Fingers on a Hand'—far apart from one another.....

"Again, the modern revolutionist knows that in order to accomplish results or promote principle, there must be unity of action. He knows that, if we do not go in a body and hang together, we are bound to hang separate. Hence, you will ever see the revolutionist submit to the will of the majority..... Hence, also, you will never find the revolutionist putting himself above the organization. The opposite conduct is an unmistakable earmark of reformers.....

"... The highest individual freedom must go hand in hand with collective freedom; and none such is possible without a central directing authority.

".... The reformer, for instance, is ever vamping against 'tyranny,' and yet watch him; give him rope enough and you will always see him straining to be the top man in the shebang, the man on horseback, the autocrat, whose whim shall be law..

"... The scatter-brained reformer is ruled by a centrifugal, the revolutionist by a centripetal force."

De Leon never sacrificed quality to quantity, principle to numbers. "The notion implied in the words of our friend who asked the question, the notion that NUMBERS is the important thing and not SOUNDNESS, often leads to bizarre results," he said. This principle, as applied to the party, prompted De Leon mercilessly to drive out of its ranks all those who in any way retreated from its fundamental principles, for, he maintained, "Tamper with discipline, allow this member [of the Party] to do as he likes, that member to slap the Party constitution in the face, yonder member to fuse with reformers, this other to forget the nature of the class struggle and to act up to his forgetfulness—allow that, keep such 'reformers' in your ranks and you have stabbed your movement at its vitals."

De Leon's opponents frequently charged him with intolerance and irreconcilability. But De Leon was by no means inclined to consider these qualities vices: "intolerance" and "irreconcilability" he regarded as necessary conditions to the success of the revolution, while "any action that, looking toward 'gentleness' or 'tolerance,' sacrifices the logic of the situation, unnerves the Revolution."

De Leon assumed a definite posi-

tion on the question of the party ownership of the press. Like Lenin, De Leon attached enormous agitational and organizational value to the press which he regarded as "the most potent weapon of the movement." And since the press, in his opinion, is not only a prerequisite, but also a product of the growth of the movement, requiring sacrifices in money, and long and great efforts, the party which has forged this powerful weapon must be confident that it will not be wrested from its hands and turned against it. De Leon, therefore, demanded vigilant control by the party over its press.

The constitution of the Socialist Labor Party demanded that every member of the party should regularly subscribe to its organ, with the exception of those members who had no party organ in their own language. No member of the party and no local committee had the right to publish a newspaper without the sanction of the National Executive Committee of the party. The latter controlled also the contents of all the party publications.

A different view was held by the Socialist party, which even up to 1914 had no newspaper of its own. Only in that year was the *American Socialist* converted into the organ of the party, published by the Central Executive Committee in Chicago. At the same time the old rule, by which any member of the party or any local was entitled to publish his or its own press organ without the control or direction of the center, was preserved.

Autonomy or centralization? This question of inner-organization of the party also served as an object of differences between the Socialist La-

bor Party and the Socialist party. While the latter allowed the state organizations autonomous rights, the constitution of the Socialist Labor Party, which was based upon the principle of centralism, gave to the National Executive Committee the power to expel any State Executive Committee.

De Leon explained the source of differences over this question as follows: The United States is a country nearly as large as all of Europe and does not constitute an economically uniform body. Capitalism has developed in every direction, but the country is so young that the primitive possibilities crop up at times even where capitalism has become deeply enrooted and, besides, the country is so vast that the primitive conditions still prevail over complete regions. Such a diversity of conditions, which testifies to different stages of economic development, inevitably breeds standards of spiritual development. A strong organization depends not only upon an identity of interests but also upon the degree to which these interests are developed.

".... A proletarian element, that still has strong navel-string connections with bourgeois interests, cannot be as solidly welded as an organization of proletarians with whom such navel-string ligaments have been sundered." The non-proletarian elements which are attracted by both proletarian elements will, by virtue of the law of natural selection, acquire the characteristics which belong to the respective organization. "The less class-developed a revolutionary element is, the less homogeneous it will be; the less homogeneous it is, the more torpid

will be its sense of sacrifice; the more torpid its sense of sacrifice, the less focalized will be its efforts. Inversely, the more class-developed a revolutionary element is, the more homogeneous will it be; the more homogeneous it is, the more active will be its sense of sacrifice; the more active its sense of sacrifice, all the more focalized will be its efforts."

The former represent the plain of the modern labor movement, and the classconscious elements its mountain. By virtue of its social nature the organization of the mountain elements conducts its work in a concentrated manner and naturally assumes a centralized form, while the elements of the plain move separately and their organization assumes the form of autonomy.

VII.

De Leon's struggle against organizational opportunism was closely connected with his struggle against opportunism in the economic and political domains.

De Leon carried out a tremendous work in cleaning the Augean stables of the trade union movement in which opportunism flourished with particular gorgousness.

At the beginning of 1898 the textile workers of New Bedford, Massachusetts, lost a long and bitterly fought strike conducted in the name of a number of immediate demands. On February 11, De Leon delivered in New Bedford an address entitled "What Means This Strike?" in which he attempted to explain to the workers "the principles of healthy organization" and "refute the theory that worker and capitalist

are brothers." Upon showing this with the aid of theoretical arguments, illustrated and backed up by figures taken from the workers' own lives, De Leon scathingly ridiculed the comparison of labor and capital with the Siamese twins: wherever one went, the other followed; when one was happy, the pulse of the other quickened; when one caught cold the other sneezed in unison with him; when one died the other followed him into the next world five minutes later. "...Do we find," De Leon asked the New Bedford textile workers, "that to be the relation of the workingman and the capitalist? Do you find that the fatter the capitalist, the fatter also grow the workingmen? Is not your experience rather that the wealthier the capitalist, the poorer are the workingmen? That the more magnificent and prouder the residences of the capitalist, the dingier and humbler become those of the workingmen? That the happier the life of the capitalist's wife, the greater the opportunities of his children for enjoyment and education, the heavier becomes the cross borne by the workingmen's wives, while their children are crowded more and more from the schools and deprived of the pleasures of childhood? Is that your experience, or is it not? (Voices all over the hall: 'It is!' and applause.)

"The pregnant point that underlies these pregnant facts," De Leon continued, "is that, between the working class and the capitalist class there is an irrepressible conflict, a class struggle for life. No glib tongued politician can vault over it, no capitalist professor or official statistician can argue it away;

no capitalist parson can veil it; no labor faker can straddle it; no 'reform' architect can bridge it over...."

And this struggle must end either in the complete subjection of the working class or in the destruction of the capitalist class. "Thus you perceive that the theory on which your 'pure and simple' trade organizations are grounded, and on which you went into this strike, is false. There being no 'common interests,' but only HOSTILE INTERESTS, between the capitalist class and the working class." De Leon emphasized again and again. It is a hopeless struggle with the aid of which "healthy relations" are to be established between the irreconcilably antagonistic classes.

Upon further exposing the secret of the primitive accumulation of capital and drawing a picture of the development of capitalism which leads to the replacement of skilled labor by machinery, the growth of the reserve labor army and the degradation of the standard of living of the bulk of the working class, and ridiculing the theory that the capitalists are the natural captains of industry, De Leon asked: Perhaps the capitalists are entitled to surplus value as inventors? But this, too, is a great mistake. The capitalists simply exploit the technical genius of others, using their distress and buying for a song the fruits of their hard mental labor. As a striking example of the acquisition by the capitalists of other people's inventions, De Leon cited the case of the employes of the Bonsack Machine Company who were noted for their unusual inventiveness. Anxious to utilize their inventions without

paying for them, the company locked out all of its men and then forced them to sign a contract by which all their future inventions would belong to the company. A certain worker invented as a result of six months of hard work, during which he did not receive a single cent from the company, a valuable machine for the production of cigarette cases. The worker himself patented his invention. But the federal court, before which the Bonsack Machine Company took up the case, issued an award in favor of the company.

This fact, as reported by De Leon, caused a storm of indignation in the hall. From all sides came the cries of "Shame! Shame!" De Leon then proceeded further to unfold his propagandist task.

".... 'Shame'?" He repeated the cries of the audience. "Say not 'Shame'! He who himself applies the torch to his own house has no cause to cry 'Shame!' when the flames consume it. Say rather 'Natural!' and smiting your own breasts say 'Ours is the fault!' Having elected into power the Democratic, Republican, Free Trade, Protection, Silver or Gold platform of the capitalist class, the working class has none but itself to blame, if the official lackeys of that class turn against the working class the public powers put into their hands."

By this chain of arguments De Leon helped the audience to realize the basic "principle of healthy organization," the fundamental elements of Marxism, which were astonishing revelations to the overwhelming majority of American workers.

These principles are as follows: Firstly, the workers will gain their freedom only after abolishing the capitalist system of private property and socializing the means of production. Secondly, the workers must wrest the power from the claws of the capitalist class. Thirdly, the workers must not regard politics as a private affair; politics, like economics, is the common business of all the workers.

In this way De Leon educated the working masses with a view to freeing them from the influence of the opportunists.

De Leon attached tremendous importance to the trade unions. He saw in them not only an instrument of labor's self-defense against the capitalist offensive, but also one of the most important and necessary instruments for the overthrow of the capitalist system. The labor movement, he maintained, is the lance which will strike down capitalism; the party is the sharp point of this lance, and the trade union is its shaft. Without the latter the lance cannot possess the necessary stability, without strong, classconscious and properly organized unions the party is useless. Only in view of the existing backwardness of the trade union movement in the United States and its division, is the bourgeoisie able to resort to threats of a general lockout in order to bring pressure upon the working class voters, as was the case in 1896 when, with the aid of this method, the bourgeoisie forced the election to the presidency of its henchman McKinley, and forced the defeat, not even of a Socialist, but of the radical Democrat, Bryan. The importance of classconscious Industrial

Unions thus consists also in that they must establish, at the proper time, control over production and lock out the bourgeoisie.

Some time around 1904—when De Leon's particular system of ideas took final form—De Leon began to regard the trade unions as the nuclei of the future society, as organizations which would take over the direction of the economic life of society after the revolution.

But the trade unions will be able to solve both their immediate and historical problems only if they adopt different ideas and a different system of organization. The craft union, De Leon urged, appeared during the early days of capitalism and represented an unarmed hand which the workers instinctively raised to ward off the capitalist blows. Since then capitalism has grown to manhood, has changed its structure and become converted into a nationally and universally organized monopoly organism, while the trade unions continue in the same infantile condition and preserve their antiquated, archaic organizational form. They represent obsolete weapons, as completely useless as a nineteenth century cannon in the face of a modern navy. The craft union is like a pint which cannot hold three gallons of labor. The trade unions must free themselves of their narrow craft egoism and reorganize themselves along industrial lines embracing all the workers in the given industry as well as those temporarily or permanently unemployed. The Industrial Union which connects the economic struggle with the political struggle, the immediate aims with the historical objects, is

power, while "Craft unionism means impotence."

"..... Under craft unionism, only one craft marches into the battlefield at a time. By their idly looking on, the other crafts scab it upon the combatant. What with that and the likewise idle onlooking of those divisions of the workers who man the commissary department, so to speak, of the capitalist class, the class struggle presents, under craft unionism, the aspect of petty riots at which the empty stomachs and empty hands of the working class are pitted against the full ones of the employing class." De Leon was fond of comparing the classconscious, industrially organized trade union movement with a fist, and the craft movement (by organization and ideology, the so-called "pure and simple" trade union movement) with spread-out fingers fit only to serve as a fan to drive flies off the face of the capitalist class....

In the craft union movement De Leon saw the greatest obstacle to the victory of Socialism. "Capitalist development," he maintained, "deliberately seeks to perpetuate [the union] in its obsolete craft union shape as the strongest bulwark for the continuance of capitalism."

[The Socialist Labor Party characterized "the American Federation of Labor and kindred organizations as the representatives of the reactionary anti-Socialist craft union movement and as an obstacle in the path for the improvement of conditions and the emancipation of labor."

The Socialist party, as officially represented, occupied in fact a position of neutrality as regards trade

unionism. That position had been formally ratified at the 1912 convention. The trade union resolution at that meeting declares, among the rest: "That the party has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in any controversies which may exist within the labor union movement over questions of form of organization or technical methods of action in the industrial struggle. [What language!—L. R.], but trusts to the labor organizations themselves to solve these questions."

De Leon stamped this position a product of opportunism and a direct betrayal of working class interests. "Neutrality toward trade unions is equivalent to 'neutrality toward the machinations of the capitalist class,'" declared the followers of De Leon. "Its practical part [of the burning question of trade unionism]," said De Leon, "implies struggle, dauntless struggle against, and war to the knife with that combination of ignoramuses, ripened into reprobates—the labor faker who seeks to coin the helplessness of the proletariat into cash for himself, and the 'intellectual' (God save the mark!) who has so superficial a knowledge of things that the mission of unionism is a closed book to him; who believes the union will 'fritter out of existence'; who, consequently, is actually against the union, all his pretenses of love for it notwithstanding; and who meantime imagines he can promote Socialism by howling with pure and

simple wolves that keep the working class divided, and, consequently, bar the path for the triumph of Socialism, or, as the capitalist *Wall Street Journal* well expressed it, 'constitutes the bulwark of modern society against Socialism.'"

The Party, taught De Leon, "must either inspire the union with the broad, political purpose, and thus dominate it by warring on the labor faker and on the old guild notions that hamstring the labor movement, or it is itself dragged down to the selfish trade interests of the economic movement, and finally drawn into the latter's subservience to the capitalist interests that ever fasten themselves to the selfish trade interests on which the labor faker, or labor lieutenant of the capitalist class, thrives."]*

Originally, De Leon supported the policy of boring from within. Thus, under his leadership, the party with the aid of the Jewish Labor Union which was under De Leon's influence, captured in 1894 the New York district organization of the Knights of Labor. At the Knights of Labor convention in the following year the radicals succeeded in defeating the reactionary leader of the Order, Powderley, who was opposed to a militant strike policy and supported peaceful cooperative development, but his place was taken by a certain Sovereign, who was a worthy successor of his reactionary predecessor.

In 1893 the United States was

gripped by a serious economic crisis which shook the entire country. The number of unemployed reached the unprecedented figure of 6 million. The beginnings of the 90's were marked by a series of big battles between the workers and trustified capital and at the same time by a number of disastrous defeats of the American working class. It is sufficient to mention the famous events in Homestead where the United States Steel Corporation, with which the Carnegie Co. amalgamated, proclaimed war upon "The Amalgamated Union of Steel, Iron and Tin Workers." The workers smashed up the forces of the detective and terroristic organizations which were hired by the trust to fight the trade union, but were themselves smashed by the superior forces of the special police. All of these events deeply stirred the American working masses.

In 1893 a group of Socialists, headed by T. J. Morgan, made an attempt to utilize the situation for the organization of a mass labor party drawing its support, like the British Labor party, from the trade unions. De Leon was sceptical of the success of this attempt. He did not believe in the possibility of converting the American Federation of Labor into an organization recognizing the principles of Socialism. The result of Morgan's policy was that many delegates of the A. F. of L. convention took a stand in favor of Morgan's resolution, and even Gompers was instructed by his union to vote for this resolution. But the leaders of the A. F. of L. were determined at all cost to disrupt the attempt of the Socialists to drive the trade unions to the path of the class

struggle. Gompers himself voted against the resolution on the ground that the workers who favored it "did not know what they were doing." The further policy of Gompers's group consisted in gaining time in order to wade over the crisis and finally to kill any attempt to create a class labor party. Gompers's policy was crowned with success.

The outcome of the struggle between the Socialists and the A. F. of L. leaders for the "soul" of the trade unions, as well as the abortive attempt to capture the order of the Knights of Labor, finally confirmed De Leon in his determination to wage an uncompromising fight upon the A. F. of L. and similar organizations. Beginning with 1895, De Leon definitely abandoned the policy of "boring from within," that is, of capturing the craft unions by working with them, and resolutely took up the path of dual unionism. "The trade union leaders," De Leon used to say, "will let you bore from within only enough to throw you out through that hole bored by you." At the end of 1895 the Socialist Labor Party, under De Leon's leadership, organized a new trade union organization, the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, with a revolutionary Socialist platform.

In the address already cited above, "What Means This Strike," De Leon described the reasons for the creation of the Alliance as follows: "Long did the Socialist Labor Party and New Trade Unionists seek to deliver this important message ['the essential principles'] to the broad masses of the American proletariat, the rank and file of our working class. But we could not reach, we could not get at them. Be-

*The part in brackets which, as we see, refers specifically to the Socialist Labor Party was simply and conveniently eliminated from the text published in the *Communist*, thus proving the Anarcho-Communist as unscrupulous and narrowly censorious, and as ignorantly prejudiced against, and fearful of revolutionary Marxism as his bourgeois and clerical confreres.—*Publishers*.

tween us and them there stood a solid wall of ignorant, stupid and corrupt labor fakers. Like men groping in a dark room for an exit, we moved along the wall, bumping our heads, feeling ever onwards for a door; we made the circuit and no passage was found. The wall was solid. This discovery once made, there was no way other than to batter a breach through that wall. With the battering ram of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance we effected a passage; the wall now crumbles; at last we stand face to face with the rank and file of the American proletariat and we ARE DELIVERING OUR MESSAGE—as you may judge from the howl that goes up from that fakers' wall that we have broken through."

In the so-called "pure and simple" unions, that is, in the unions which were organized along craft lines, De Leon refused to see a part of the labor movement. "Accordingly, the union that is a 'Brotherhood of Capital and Labor' concern is a capitalist brigade; accordingly, only the classconscious union stands within the pale of the labor movement."

De Leon compared the craft labor movement with the Czarist army. The craft union consists of workers, and the Czarist army also consists of toilers; in both cases the decisive factor lies in the fact that these organizations are controlled by forces hostile to labor and serve interests hostile to labor. And just as in Russia the toilers cannot gain freedom without crushing the Czarist army, just so in America will the working class fail to solve its problems unless it destroys the craft unions. In full, De Leon's trade

union policy was described by him as follows:

"That analysis shows you that trades organizations are essential; they are essential to break the force of the onslaught of the capitalist, but this advantage is fruitful of good only in the measure that the organization prepares itself for the day of final victory. Accordingly, it must be every Socialist's endeavor to organize his trade. If there is an organization of his trade in existence that is not in the hand of a labor lieutenant of capital, he should join it and wheel it into line with the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. If, however, the organization is entirely in the hands of such a labor lieutenant of capital; if its membership is grown so fast to him and he to them, that the one cannot be shaken from the other; if, accordingly, the organization, obedient to the spirit of capitalism, insists upon dividing the working class by barriers more or less high and chicanery against the admission of all the members of the trade who apply for admission; if his grip of mental corruption upon it is such as to cause a majority of its members to applaud and second his endeavors to keep that majority at work at the sacrifice of the minority within and of the large majority of the trade without—in that and in all such cases, such an organization is not a limb of the labor movement, it is a limb of capitalism; it is a GUILD; it is a belated reproduction of the old guild system!"

Such an organization, De Leon said, is no more of a labor organization than the Czarist army. "In such a case the Socialist must endeavor to set up a bona fide labor

trades union and to do what he can to smash the fraud."

It is characteristic that the policy of withdrawing from the reactionary trade unions for the purpose of creating classconscious industrial organizations was supported not only by the Socialist Labor Party but also by the left wing of the Socialist party, including Eugene Debs, one of the most popular leaders of the American workers.*

The peculiar condition of the American labor movement—the fact that the tremendous majority of the workers are unorganized, the artificial measures taken by the reactionary leaders to perpetuate this scourge of American labor—in some cases make inevitable the policy of dual unionism. The policy of unity at all cost cannot, under the American conditions, always yield favorable results (of course, from the point of view of the revolutionary proletariat). We know that in recent years the development of the labor movement in the United States inevitably led to the forma-

tion of new unions (of needle trades workers, furriers, textile workers, miners) which broke with the A. F. of L. and joined the Profintern. At the beginning of September 1929 a national convention was held in the United States which created a new trade union center to lead those organizations which adhere to the platform of the class struggle. Thus, life forced the advanced workers of America to consolidate their forces on a new foundation.**

The main weakness of De Leon's policy consisted of its sectarian extremes, exaggerations and intolerance. Was it not meaningless for the S. L. P. to adopt in 1900 a resolution forbidding members of the party to hold leading offices in the craft unions and admit into the party officials of such unions? Is it not the duty of the party, on the contrary, to utilize the capture by its individual members of leading positions in the trade unions for the purpose of directing these organizations along the proper path?***

*Debs: "There is but one way to effect this great change, and that is for the workman to sever his relations with the American Federation and join the union that proposes upon the economic field to represent his class." (L. R.)

[But it should also be noted of Debs that he remained to his end with the party, the S. P., that ever kotowed to the A. F. of L., giving his endorsement and unqualified support to the reactionary program of the S. P. politicians.—Publishers.]

** This statement is ridiculous—so ridiculous that one wonders what becomes of the critical faculties of men like Raisky when confronted with individuals and situations supposedly involved in the propaganda work in Soviet Russia. For Raisky evidently has been taken in by the "foolscap paper unions" launched from time to time by the United States Anarcho-Communists, but which we in this country know to be either totally non-existent or utterly worthless.—Publishers.

*** This criticism of De Leon, and the reference to his policy as being "sectarian," "extreme," "exaggerated" and "intolerant," are as presumptuous on the part of Mr. Raisky as they are unfounded. De Leon knew well what he was doing. By 1900 it had become clear to De Leon that the A. F. of L. was no more to be captured by degrees, or reformed from within, than was capitalist society to be so captured and reformed.

This sectarian attitude of De Leon, which caused the revolutionary labor movement of the United States a good deal of harm, was due to the fact that he overestimated the immediate revolutionary possibilities in the United States. It is the fate of many revolutionists to see the much desired goal much nearer than it is in reality. De Leon looked upon the historical prospects of America through field glasses. In 1893 Debs created the industrial American Railroad Union which soon embraced 150,000 workers. In that same year was organized the Western Federation of Miners which adopted a Socialist platform. In 1897 the Western Federation of Miners withdrew from the American Federation of Labor. True, during that year the American Labor Union fell under the powerful blows of the capitalist offensive; true, by 1905 the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance had only 1,400 members, but, to offset this, the Industrial Workers of the World was organized as a mass labor organization the role of which in the organization of the revolutionary elements of American labor must not be underestimated. These facts confirmed De Leon in his belief in the possibility of the speedy capture of the majority of American labor on behalf of revolutionary Socialism. But the road toward this coveted object proved to be much more difficult and devious than De Leon thought. In the next article I will show that the great American revolutionist learned the lesson of the movement and in 1908 adopted a more sober and flexible position on tactical problems, though even then he did not completely free himself from the elements of sectarianism.

Hence, no point of importance attaches to the argument of Rasky that members of the Party should secure leading positions in the craft unions "for the purpose of directing these organizations along the proper path." The best that able and loyal members in such positions could do would be to obstruct, temporarily, the work of the fakers, but how long would they last? The history of the movement has established the fact that if a revolutionist in the craft union "bores from within" to a purpose, he will, perforce, *bore himself out*. And what applied to a Socialist working in the ranks would obviously apply with still greater force to one who held office, with the complication of personal material interests, and the obvious temptation to the individual, added. If the chiefs of the A. F. of L. were labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, it goes without saying that the petty officers were bound to act as "labor corporals" and "labor sergeants" of the capitalist class. De Leon, as usual, was right. Far from being "sectarian" or "intolerant," he was far-seeing, with the broad vistas of the logical future development before him.—*Publishers*.

* On the contrary, De Leon did not overestimate "the immediate revolutionary possibilities in the United States." He always conditioned any statement he made on this head with an "if"—the "if the working class (or a sufficient number) were organized in revolutionary economic unions." The repeated references to De Leon's "sectarianism" suggests that Rasky is not familiar with the fact that Marx was similarly accused, in identical language, by his superficial critics. Rasky cannot be ignorant of the fact that Lenin was also thus accused, as will be, indeed, every strong personality who steers his course by a "polar truth or principle."—*Publishers*.

VIII.

De Leon's greatest merit was his consistent and uncompromising struggle against parliamentary cretinism.

Does not a "visionary politician" deserve contempt, "the man who imagines that by going to the ballot box, and taking a piece of paper, and looking about to see if anybody is watching, and throwing it in and then rubbing his hands and jollying himself with the expectation that through that process, through some mystic alchemy, the ballot will terminate capitalism, and the Socialist Commonwealth will rise like a fairy out of the ballot box," said De Leon.

The most important task of revolutionary Socialism De Leon saw in the destruction of the "mystic mazes of what Marx called the 'cretinism (idiocy) of bourgeois parliamentarism.'"

This does not mean that De Leon denied the necessity of utilizing the bourgeois parliament. He merely pointed out that, inasmuch as the Socialist vote is a question of right, unless it is based upon power, it is

"weaker than woman's tears,
Tamer than sleep, fonder than ignorance,
Less valiant than the virgin in the night,
And skillless as unpracticed infancy."

In parliamentarism De Leon saw primarily an instrument of revolutionary propaganda. But in order that the parliamentary activity of the Socialists could perform this function it must be "uncompromisingly revolutionary."

W. Liebknecht's aphorism, "To

parliamentarize is to compromise, to log-roll, to sell out," De Leon considered admissible only under the conditions of a bourgeois revolution, but such a policy is "a badge of treason to the working class" when applied in modern America.

De Leon hated with a deadly hatred the opportunists from the Socialist party who, in the chase for votes, supported the A. F. of L. in its struggle against the colored workers, proclaimed its neutrality toward the reactionary trade union leaders, entered into unprincipled blocs with capitalists of the type of Hearst (the newspaper magnate), etc., and hopelessly sank in the mire of political and other reforms. "All such 'improvements,'" De Leon said—"like the modern 'ballot reforms' and schemes for 'referendums,' 'initiative,' 'election of Federal Senators by popular vote,' and what not—are, in the very nature of things, so many lures to allow the revolutionary heat to radiate into vacancy." The task of the proletariat consists of socializing the means of production "without which the cross he bears today will wax ever heavier, to be passed on still heavier to his descendants. No 'forms' will stand."

In 1912 an event occurred in the political life of the United States which strongly corroborated De Leon's view of reformism as an instrument for the deceit of the working class. The former President Theodore Roosevelt quarreled with the Republican party bosses who nominated Taft, Roosevelt's rival, as candidate for presidency, and decided to run for election without the support of the Republican party, hoping to attract the masses of dis-

contented workers and farmers. For this purpose he advanced an election platform which was completely copied from the Socialist party and secured more than 4 million votes. One of the leaders of the Socialist party, Victor L. Berger, kept on complaining that Roosevelt robbed the Socialist party.* One naturally recalls De Leon's reference to the reformist platform as the banana skin which will cause the reformist to slip himself and bring down the proletariat with him.

In close logical connection with De Leon's struggle against parliamentary cretinism stands his struggle against respect for bourgeois institutions and legality. In September, 1912, *The Visitor*, a weekly organ of a certain ultramontane organization in Rhode Island, published fifteen questions which, in the opinion of its editors, were to put Socialism to shame in the eyes of every respectable citizen. Among these questions, which the editors recommended the readers to cut out and always carry with them, one related to confiscation. Do not the Socialists, *The Visitor* asked, intend to confiscate capital? De Leon at once gave a comprehensive reply in the *Daily People*. To him this question was neither new nor unexpected. He had given the answer to it on April 14, 1912, in a debate in the city of Troy on the question of "Individualism versus Socialism," and ten years earlier, in 1902, in "Two Pages from Roman History."

The proletarian revolution, De Leon replied, strives to socialize all means of production. This act will be a crime from the point of view of capitalist laws and conceptions, but every revolution carries with it its own code of laws. From the point of view of the British, Jefferson, the leader of the anti-British revolution for national independence, was a "confiscator," for, contrary to the British laws, he wrested the American colonies from England's hands, but from the point of view of the American people, including the bourgeoisie, Jefferson was a national hero who proved to be able to ignore the laws of the oppressor and establish new laws corresponding to the interests of the liberated people. The bourgeoisie itself, when acting as a revolutionary class, pointed out to the proletariat the way to the solution of its historical class tasks. The bourgeois legality does not in any way permit the proletarian revolution. The latter carries within its womb its own statute. "The revolutionist who seeks the cloak of 'legality,' is a revolutionist spent. He is a boy playing at soldier."

As a striking example of the helplessness of a Socialist who has not learned to take a dialectical view of the problem of law and who does not dare honestly and openly to explain it to the workers, De Leon referred to the case of Thomas J. Morgan, whom we have already mentioned in connection with the attempt to organize a labor party. In

1894, while addressing the American Federation of Labor convention in Delaware with a vehement appeal in the name of Socialism, Morgan was interrupted by one of the leaders of the Federation, Adolf Strasser.

"May I ask you a question?"

"Of course."

"Do you approve of *confiscation*?"

And Morgan fizzled out like a bubble. Strasser felt that he gave the Socialist agitator a knock-out blow.

IX.

De Leon was an internationalist.* The sharp weapon of his criticism he directed not only against the native opportunism but also against its manifestation in the international labor movement. De Leon belonged to the consistent left wing of the Second International.** He was one of the first to raise arms against Kautsky and expose his opportunism when Kautsky was still at the zenith of his revolutionary fame.

De Leon took up and popularized the apt description of Kautsky's Paris resolution (1900) on the Millerand case, as a "Kaoutchouc resolution." At the Amsterdam Congress, De Leon delivered a sharp attack upon Kautsky and demanded a revi-

sion of the Paris resolution. Here is the resolution which De Leon submitted in the name of the Socialist Labor Parties of the United States, Australia and Canada:

"Whereas, The struggle between the working class and the capitalist class is a continuous and irrepressible conflict, a conflict that tends every day rather to be intensified than to be softened;

"Whereas, The existing governments are committees of the ruling class, intended to safeguard the yoke of capitalist exploitation upon the neck of the working class;

"Whereas, At the last International Congress, held in Paris, in 1900, a resolution generally known as the Kautsky resolution, was adopted, the closing clauses of which contemplate the emergency of the working class accepting office at the hands of such capitalist governments, and also, especially, presuppose the possibility of impartiality on the part of the ruling class governments, in the conflicts between the working class and the capitalist class; and

"Whereas, The said clauses—applicable, perhaps, in countries not yet wholly freed from feudal institutions—were adopted under conditions both in France and in the

* Here is what Lenin wrote about the result of the 1912 elections: "Lastly, the importance of the election lies in the unusually clear and striking manifestation of bourgeois reformism as a means of struggle against Socialism.... Roosevelt has been obviously hired by the clever millionaires to preach this fraud." (Lenin's Works, 1925, Vol. 12, Part 1, pp. 323-324.)—L. R.

* In 1911 De Leon sharply took to task the only Socialist Congressman, Victor Berger, for failing to make use of the congressional platform for the international education of the workers. In the opinion of De Leon, Berger should have made an international demonstration during the election of the Speaker at the first meeting of the Congress, by nominating its own candidature in the name of "The American Branch of the International Socialist Family." (See "Berger's Hit and Misses" [now known as "Revolutionary Socialism in U. S. Congress"], by Daniel De Leon, New York, 1919). — L. R.

** De Leon attended the following congresses of the Second International, the Congress of Zurich (1893), Amsterdam (1904), Stuttgart (1907), and Copenhagen (1910).—L. R.

Paris Congress itself, that justify erroneous conclusions on the nature of the class struggle, the character of capitalist governments and the tactics that are imperative upon the proletariat in the pursuit of its campaign to overthrow the capitalist system in countries, which, like the United States of America, have wholly wiped out feudal institutions; therefore be it

"Resolved, First, That the said Kautsky Resolution be and the same is hereby repealed as a principle of general Socialist tactics;

"Second, That, in fully developed capitalist countries like America, the working class cannot, without betrayal of the cause of the proletariat, fill any political office other than such that they conquer for and by themselves."

It is noteworthy that if De Leon very conditionally (perhaps) admits of the possibility of applying Kautsky's policy in countries which have not yet been freed from the elements of feudalism and which were therefore, as De Leon thought, still unripe for the Socialist revolution, for the Anglo-Saxon countries, and pri-

marily for the United States, where, according to De Leon, after the Civil War of 1861-1865, the working class and the capitalist class faced each other as enemies, De Leon insisted upon an uncompromising revolutionary policy which is at the present time formulated as the policy of the class struggle.

The relations between De Leon and the leaders of the Second International, particularly Kautsky, were cool and strained. According to Boris Reinstein, a former member of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labor Party and De Leon's right hand man,* the latter went without enthusiasm to the congress of the Second International where the S. L. P. delegations were practically ignored and the Hillquits and Simonses felt in their own element. The situation in America and the struggle between the two Socialist parties of the United States were judged by the malicious speeches of the Socialist party representatives at the congress and in the leading European Socialist journals, particularly the *Neue Zeit*, where De Leon was painted as an anarch-

*One must suppose that Mr. Raisky learned from Reinstein himself that he was De Leon's "right hand man," for certainly no one else knew it, least of all De Leon. But Raisky does well to refer to Reinstein as a former member of the N.E.C. of the S.L.P., though he does not tell (probably because he does not know) how he came to be a former member. Reinstein had in 1912 proposed that the S. L. P. vacate the political field, and urged that the individual members of the S. L. P. join the treacherous and corrupt bourgeois Socialist party. When he ran for reelection as member of the N.E.C. he was overwhelmingly defeated, and solely because of his proposed "sell-out" to the S. P. De Leon was incensed, so much so, in fact, that when in 1914 Reinstein (in a letter to the National Secretary of the Party) inquired of De Leon (who was then lying ill in a New York hospital) as to what the latter thought of his running for delegate to the then projected International Socialist Congress at Vienna, De Leon made it unmistakably clear that if Reinstein was running he would not receive De Leon's vote. The less Raisky or any one else says about Reinstein being De Leon's "right hand man," the better. For Reinstein had a knife (his unity obsession) up his sleeve, and never missed an opportunity to jab this knife into the vitals of the Party.—Publishers.

ist and a wrecker of the trade unions.

De Leon was inclined to explain the coolness of the leaders of the International toward the Socialist Labor Party by the difference between the social and economic structure of the United States and of the European countries. "They cannot understand us," De Leon maintained, "we are divided from them not only by a physical but also by a historical ocean. They still live under semi-feudal conditions while we are at the threshold of the Socialist revolution." We will not criticize here De Leon's mistake which consisted of his failure to understand the possibility of the Socialist revolution breaking out first in a country with a "relatively smaller development of industry.* To us one thing is unquestionable, the cool attitude of the leaders of the Second International toward De Leon's Socialist Labor Party sprang from the same sources which were responsible for the coolness toward the Russian

Bolsheviks, the Bulgarian "Tessniaks," the Dutch "Tribunists," in short toward the revolutionary wing of the international labor movement.

X.

Up to 1918 Lenin was apparently unacquainted with the works and views of De Leon. At the Stuttgart congress, to which both De Leon and Lenin were delegates, they worked in different commissions (the former in the trade union commission) and did not meet in their work.

In 1918 an article was published in the *Workers' Dreadnought*, entitled "Marx, De Leon and Lenin." The article was signed by Margaret White, the pseudonym of a prominent British Communist. The author of the article expressed the belief that De Leon was Lenin's predecessor in anticipating the Soviet system. [The same idea was expressed by the author in his book "Communism and Society," by W. Paul, 1922.—L.R.] Lenin then be-

*As regards De Leon's stand toward the leaders of the Social Democracies in Europe: He never hesitated pointing them out clearly as reformers and not Socialists. He was, however, at all times willing to give them the benefit of the doubt as far as handling the situation in their own countries or perhaps, rather, was he overanxious to show that while he demanded no interference from the International in American affairs in general relations to the Socialist movement, he granted the same non-interference to the other parties in the International as long as the Socialist Labor Party remained a member thereof.

As to De Leon's "failure to understand the possibilities of the Socialist revolution as breaking out in a country with a 'relatively smaller development of industry,'" De Leon was perfectly well aware that the Socialist revolution might at any time break out in a country like Russia for example (See, for example, "Flashlights of Amsterdam Congress," p. 131 to end of Chapter XII, and "Russia in Revolution," editorial "Is It to Be," p. 29.), where the old system was hanging over and was rotten ripe for overthrow, though he regarded it as logical to expect it to break out in the United States first. What De Leon emphasized and what the Socialist Labor Party still says is that Socialism, fully developed, must inevitably take precedence in a country of highly developed industry. In this Lenin agreed with us when he said "that it was easy for Russia, in the concrete, historically quite unique, situation of 1917, to begin a social revolution; whereas to continue it and complete it will be more difficult for Russia than for other European countries." ("Left Wing' Communism.")—Publishers.

came greatly interested in the American revolutionist and asked B. Reinstein to bring him De Leon's works which Lenin studied only at the end of 1918, after recovering from his wound.

On May 11, 1918, the WEEKLY PEOPLE, the organ of the Socialist Labor Party, published an address by John Reed, of which the following is an excerpt:

"Premier Lenin, said Reed, is a great admirer of Daniel De Leon, considering him the greatest of modern Socialists—the only one who has added anything to Socialist thought since Marx. Reinstein managed to take with him to Russia a few of the pamphlets written by De Leon, but Lenin wants more. He asked Reed to try hard to send several copies of all of De Leon's published works, and also a copy of 'With De Leon Since '89,' a biography by Rudolph Katz.

"Lenin intends to translate this into Russian and write an introduction to it."*

In a private conversation B. Reinstein told me that at the end of May, 1919, he spoke with Lenin about De Leon.

"But did not De Leon err on the side of 'sectarianism'?" Lenin asked half jestingly, half earnestly, but added that he was mightily impressed by the sharp and deep criticism of reformism given by De Leon in his "Two Pages from Roman History," as well as by the fact that as far back as April, 1904, De Leon anticipated such an essential element of the Soviet system as the abolition of parliament and its replacement by representatives from production units.

Of course this is not the Soviet system but only an element of the Soviet system. From the Bolsheviks De Leon was divided by his failure to understand the inevitability and necessity of a transitional epoch in the form of a dictatorship of the proletariat. He believed that the Socialist revolution would at once eliminate the State, and that society would step right into developed Socialism on the morrow of the revolution. This explains De Leon's denial of the need for a party, after the revolution. We can thus see that no equation mark can be drawn between De Leon and Bolshevism.** However, there is one thing which

unquestionably makes them akin to each other, namely, the uncompromising and determined opposition to opportunism in all its forms and manifestations.

*

De Leon died on May 11, 1914, that is, before the World War and the Russian Revolution. We have every reason to believe that the

great American revolutionist would have learned the lessons of these historical events and supported the position of Leninism. In any case, De Leon's unquestionable merit consists in that in a number of Anglo-Saxon countries he trained cadres of revolutionary Marxists who are now struggling within the ranks of the Communist International.

majority of the population belongs to the petty land-holder producers, is possible only by reason of a number of special transition measures, *which would be entirely unnecessary in countries having a developed capitalism, where the wage earners in industry and agriculture constitute an immense majority.* In countries with a highly developed capitalism, there has been for decades a developed class of wage workers engaged in agriculture. Only such a class can serve as a support to an *immediate* transition to Socialism, socially, economically and politically. *Only in countries in which this class is sufficiently developed will the transition from capitalism to Socialism be possible.* [Emphasis ours.] (Speech on "Our Relation to the Peasants," delivered at the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist party, March 15, 1921.)

It is further clear that Mr. Raisky has failed to understand the essential meaning of the phrase, "the dictatorship of the proletariat." For a more complete treatment of this and related subjects Mr. Raisky and the readers are referred to "Proletarian Democracy vs. Dictatorships and Despotism," by Arnold Petersen. (New York Labor News Co., Publishers.)—Publishers.

* Quoted from Olive M. Johnson's "Daniel De Leon, Our Comrade," which was published in the Symposium "Daniel De Leon, The Man and His Work," I. p. 81, New York, 1926. Lenin's great interest in De Leon was noted also by Robert Minor (The World, Feb. 4, 1919) and Arthur Ransome ("Russia in 1919," by Arthur Ransome). According to B. Reinstein, in May, 1919, Lenin intended to write an article devoted to the fifth anniversary of De Leon's death, but some circumstances prevented him from carrying out his intentions.—L. R.

** Mr. Raisky apparently, has failed to make as close a study of Lenin as one might reasonably expect of an admirer so ardent and articulate. Had he been as familiar with Lenin's writings as his professed acceptance of "Leninism" implies, he could scarcely have been guilty of the misconception expressed in his reference to "the inevitability and necessity of a transitional epoch in the form of a dictatorship of the proletariat." To Mr. Raisky is commended the following utterance by Lenin:

"There is no doubt that the Socialist revolution in a country where the immense

APPENDIX.

*By the Editor of the Weekly People and the
National Secretary, Socialist Labor Party.*

We have presented here a Russian on De Leon, one out of the many of the Bolshevik group of revolutionists who have taken pains to inform themselves about the great American revolutionist, the man who Lenin said was the only one who had added something to Socialist theory since Marx. One side of De Leon's genius Mr. Raisky has comprehended and fully appreciated, viz., his clear and clean-cut position against the reformer who calls himself a Socialist and the capitalist lieutenant who poses as a labor leader. The struggle in Russia against the Mensheviks, which presently enlarged to a struggle against practically the entire Social Democracy in Europe, placed the Bolsheviks in the identical position in relation to these Social patriots and traitors to the working class and the Socialist movement that De Leon and the Socialist Labor Party gradually worked up to during the nineties and have assumed uncompromisingly from that time onward. So far Mr. Raisky's article is excellent.

When, however, Mr. Raisky from time to time crosses the bar into De Leon's particular tactical position of the movement as specifically applied to this country, he suffers the usual collapse of the Russian unable to see the necessary tactical difference of the movement in a highly developed

industrial country and a country like Russian where the revolutionary movement is obliged to do the work that Russian capitalism never rose high enough to perform. This defect of Mr. Raisky's understanding is particularly evident, is in fact summarized, in the last couple of paragraphs. "De Leon," says Raisky admiringly, practically quoting Lenin, "anticipated such an essential element of the Soviet system as the abolition of parliament and its replacement by representation of production units." But he adds that, of course, this is only one element of the Soviet system. This is true, but on the other hand, it is also true that the Soviet system is only "an element" of Socialism, really a makeshift until the conditions of Russia have ripened and are ready for Socialism. Because of this the next sentence of Raisky puts the matter entirely on its head. De Leon did not fail to understand the necessity of a transitional period in the form of a dictatorship of the proletariat in a country like Russia with little industrial development and a tremendous peasant population. He saw this necessity as clearly as Marx did. But he also saw what Marx in the England of the 80's could at least sense, but what even today the most advanced of the Russian revolutionists fail to

comprehend, namely, that in a country where industry is so highly developed as in America, and where the working class is both drilled and thoroughly organized for industrial operation, if that working class is also organized on the industrial field in a revolutionary industrial organization, it is possible—nay, more than possible, inevitable—for the political organization, as rapidly as it can be accomplished, to turn over all power of government to the Industrial Union. To do otherwise would be, as De Leon has repeatedly pointed out, a usurpation, treason to the Revolution. This the Russians cannot see. The low level of their own industrial development obscures their vision. We do not blame them for not being able to see our position, but we refuse, of course, to be influenced by the tactics of a revolutionary movement placed in such a position.

It has been remarked that Lenin erred when he said that De Leon had added something to revolutionary Socialist theory, i.e., that he had actually developed the theories of Marx to their fullest conclusion. It is said that, on the other hand, all that De Leon did was to do what Lenin himself did, forge a key that fitted Russia and that therefore De Leon added no more to Socialist theory than Lenin did. But this is wrong and Lenin was right. We believe he had the genius to see, or at least to sense the difference between De Leon and himself in this respect. Lenin fell upon a revolutionary situation when it was necessary to "invent" a makeshift state to hold the revolution till the conditions of Russia could be brought up to Socialism. Thus what he "added" was neither

Socialism nor Socialist theory. The Soviet State was merely a tactical necessity to bridge over an interim. But the Industrial Union and the Industrial Government idea is something quite different; it is Socialism complete, Socialism in operation, the Socialist Industrial Republic which had never before been fully comprehended. While all countries need not go through Sovietism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, all countries will have to organize industrially into the Industrial Union and the Industrial Government before they can reach Socialism—for the Industrial Government is Socialism. There is no other.

*

Mr. Raisky concludes his essay on De Leon in a rather remarkable fashion. He says: "In any case, De Leon's unquestionable merit consists in that a number of Anglo-Saxon countries he trained cadres of revolutionary Marxists who are now struggling within the ranks of the Communist International." Mr. Raisky is familiar with Lenin's tributes to De Leon since he quotes one of them himself, and the clearest at that. When Lenin says that De Leon was the only modern Socialist "who has added anything to Socialist thought since Marx," does Mr. Raisky suppose that Lenin had in mind the "cadres" (to use his or his translator's barbarous expression) of "revolutionary Marxists" struggling in the Communist International? Or does he suppose Lenin had in mind De Leon's working out of the form "at last discovered" under which, in fully developed capitalist countries, might be carried out the economic emancipation of labor? And as for these "cadres" of would-be revolu-

tionary Marxists, we ask: When, where? Surely Mr. Raisky cannot mean Reinstein, who was specifically repudiated by De Leon. He cannot mean the windbag Wm. Paul of whom De Leon never heard and who repudiated all that De Leon ever taught. Nor can Raisky have in mind Rudolph Katz, who not only denied his master more shamefully than any other, but who to desertion added base betrayal of all that is implied in the designation "revolutionary Marxist." For it was Mr. Katz who in 1917, in characteristic social patriot fashion, and in line with his denial "in toto" that the S. P. was a bourgeois outfit, wrote President Woodrow Wilson from Jamestown, N. Y.:

"These threats [of the manufacturers of Jamestown], if carried out, would seriously affect the *present peaceful relations between employees and employers in general in this city and have a tendency to cripple industry indeed.* AT THE ART METAL COMPANY OF JAMESTOWN, WHERE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS FOR STEEL FURNITURE FOR BATTLESHIPS ARE NOW BEING EXECUTED, A STRIKE WAS AVERTED BY THE COOL-HEADEDNESS OF OUR [Katz's] ORGANIZATION." (Emphasis ours.)

Mr. Raisky's compliment is a left-handed one, indeed, for anyone who can be "struggling" in the Communist International in Anglo-Saxon countries in the lunatic fashion exemplified by the United States variety, can do so only in complete negation of all that Marx and De Leon ever taught.

*

There is only one more remark we have to make in regard to this rather

remarkable article, but this does not concern Mr. Raisky but the translator. That Mr. Raisky has done most careful research is quite evident. He has used quotations from a wide range of books and pamphlets by and about De Leon and he has in each case chosen those that expressed the very kernel of "De Leonism." Besides this, he has given footnotes with very careful references as to work, edition and page. To secure the originals of these references, therefore, would have been an easy task for the translator. But to this individual "De Leon pamphlets" were either anathema or else he was conceited enough to believe he could do De Leon better than De Leon. The result in most cases was ludicrous, sometimes even more humorous than that classic, "The Jumping Frog of Calaveras County," which to the world's great amusement Mark Twain retranslated literally into English from the French translation.

We cannot refrain from quoting a few gems:

De Leon's well known sentence, "The tiger will defend the tips of his mustache with the same ferocity that he will defend his very heart," has taken this shape, "A tiger will furiously defend the ends of his mustache and will fight with even greater fury for his heart," which not only brings forth a preposterous picture of an attacked tiger philosophizing on which he will defend with the greater fury, his heart or his mustache, but, of course, it throws the whole illustration out of joint. The illustration intended to show that the capitalist will not give up even the smallest of his privileges.

This passage from "Reform or Revolution":

....The reformer, for instance, is ever vaporizing against "tyranny," and yet watch him; give him rope enough and you will always see him straining to be the top man in the shebang, the man on horseback, the autocrat, whose whim shall be law—

becomes nearly as preposterous, being translated thus:

.....A reformist always shouts against "tyranny," but just watch him; give him a free hand and he will always strive to get on top, to become a rider, an autocrat, whose whim must be law.

"To become a rider" is, of course, an absolutely meaningless figure in this connection, whereas the "man on horseback" is a well known figure of speech for the autocrat or dictator.

One more passage will suffice to show the vigor and clarity of De Leon's language as compared with the re-translation.

From "What Means This Strike":

Long did the Socialist Labor Party and New Trade Unionists seek to deliver this important message ["the essential principles"] to the broad masses of the American proletariat, the rank and file of our working class. But we could not reach, we could not get at them. Between us and them there stood a solid wall of ignorant, stupid and corrupt labor fakers. Like men groping in a dark room for an exit, we moved along the wall, bumping our heads, feeling ever onwards for a door; we made the circuit and no passage was found. The wall was solid. This discovery once made, there was no way other than to batter a breach through

that wall. With the battering ram of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance we effected a passage; the wall now crumbles; at last we stand face to face with the rank and file of the American proletariat and we ARE DELIVERING OUR MESSAGE—as you may judge from the howl that goes up from that fakers' wall that we have broken through.

As it appeared in the translation:

For a long time the Socialist Labor Party and the new trade unionists strove to convey this important message ("the healthy principles") to the broad masses of American labor, to the rank and file of our working class. But we failed to make our way toward them, we could not get to them. We were divided by a solid wall of ignorant, stupid and corrupt labor fakers. Like people groping their way out of a dark room, we moved along the wall, banging our heads against it, constantly groping for the door in front of us; we made a circle but did not find a way out. It was a blind wall. Once we made this discovery there was nothing to be done but break a way through it. By the battering ram of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance we formed an exit; now the wall is crumbling, and we are finally standing face to face with the rank and file masses of the American working class and are conveying our message to them. You can judge this by the howl coming from that wall of fakers.

But the valiant translator has not only rewritten De Leon, he has not balked at taking a hand at Shakespeare. The lines quoted by De Leon in "Socialist Reconstruction," in describing the ballot without the industrial power to back it, viz.:

weaker than woman's tears,	have become:
Tamer than sleep, fonder than ignorance,	is weaker than women's tears,
Less valiant than the virgin in the night,	Gentler than dream, madder than ignorance,
And skillless as unpracticed infancy.	Even less brave than a maiden at night,
	And artless as inexperienced childhood.

LENIN ON DE LEON.

"Lenin, closing his speech on the adoption of the Rights of Workers Bill in the congress [of Soviets] showed the influence of De Leon, whose governmental construction on the basis of industries fits admirably into the Soviet construction of the state now forming in Russia. De Leon is really the first American Socialist to affect European thought."—Arno Dosch-Fleurot, Petrograd despatch to *N.Y. World*, Jan. 31, 1918.

"Lenin said he had read in an English Socialist paper a comparison of his own theories with those of an American, Daniel De Leon. He had then borrowed some of De Leon's pamphlets from Reinstein (who belongs to the party which De Leon founded in America), read them for the first time, and was amazed to see how far and how early De Leon had pursued the same train of thought as the Russians. His theory that representation should be by industries, not by areas, was already the germ of the Soviet system. He remembered seeing De Leon at an International Conference. De Leon made no impression at all, a grey old man, quite unable to speak to such an audience; but evidently a much bigger man than he looked, since his pamphlets were written before the experience of the Russian Revolution of 1905. Some days afterwards I noticed that Lenin had introduced a few phrases of De Leon, as if to do honor to his memory, into the draft for the new program of the Communist party."—Arthur Ransome in "Six Weeks in Russia in 1919."

Lenin said: "The American Daniel De Leon first formulated the idea of a Soviet Government, which grew up on his idea. Future society will be organized along Soviet lines. There will be Soviet rather than geographical boundaries for nations. Industrial Unionism is the basic thing. That is what we are building."—Robert Minor in the *New York World*, Feb. 8, 1919.

Premier Lenin is a great admirer of Daniel De Leon, considering him the greatest of modern Socialists—the only one who has added anything to Socialist thought since Marx.... It is Lenin's opinion that the Industrial "State" as conceived by De Leon will ultimately have to be the form of government in Russia.—John Reed, May 4, 1918.

Socialist Reconstruction of Society

The Industrial Vote

By DANIEL DE LEON

"Reconstruction" is the all absorbing topic these days. What is to take the place of the present planless and anarchic form of society? How is it to be done? Read this small booklet. It presents in clear, convincing language an indictment against capitalist society, and furnishes a well defined and concrete basis for the Industrial Republic of Labor.

Read it. Study it. Pass it on to your friends and shopmates.

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS CO.
45 ROSE STREET, N. Y. CITY

The Burning Question *of* Trades Unionism

A Lecture Delivered at Newark, N. J.

By DANIEL DE LEON

Trades Unionism is one of the methods by which the exploited class of to-day—the working class—seeks to resist or minimize the power of the exploiter. The author goes into a searching analysis of trades unionism and shows how the mistakes incurred by tradesunionists lead to the nullification of their efforts at redress. Correct tactics are set forth. No student of Socialism but must be familiar with the trade union movement, therefore this book should be read.

PAPER, 10 CENTS

==== Send All Orders to =====

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS CO.

45 ROSE STREET

NEW YORK

*Two Pages
From
Roman
History*

*I. Plebs Leaders and
Labor Leaders*

*II. The Warning
of the Gracchi*

Two Lectures by
DANIEL DE LEON

The Trades Union Question is becoming the Burning Question of the day. Reform movements are simultaneously growing into political factors. In this work the "pure and simple" union labor leader is held up to the light of the plebeians' experience with the leaders of their time; and, through the failure of the Gracchian movement, it is shown how modern reforms are pit-falls for the labor movement of to-day.

A 96-PAGE PAMPHLET SELLING AT
price twenty-five cents

New York Labor News Co.

45 ROSE ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

AS TO POLITICS

— DANIEL DE LEON —

"Parliamentarian," "political action," "industrial action," "revolutionary action," "mass action," "anarchy," "dynamitism," "physical force," "legality," "civilized methods" are terms which today are loosely bandied about by the capitalist papers as well as by all manners of so-called "revolutionaries." In the discussion under the general heading "As to Politics" De Leon has made all these and many other terms, now in daily use, perfectly clear.

The Socialist speaks correctly and with scientific precision. There is no better mirror of the chaos prevailing in the labor movement today than that produced in this book by the opponents of the S. L. P. position; there is no clearer defence of revolution and civilization than the answers given by De Leon.

No pamphlet issued by the Party is of greater importance at this time. Buy it, sell it, and spread the light!

PRICE 30 CENTS

**New York Labor News Co., 45 Rose St.
New York City**

The Gotha Program

By KARL MARX

and

Did Marx Err?

By Daniel De Leon

Here is a splendid pamphlet for the Socialist student—especially for the student of Socialist tactics. It is in Marx's very best vein, and constitutes a vigorous condemnation of the muddleheaded reformer who parades under the name of Socialism.

With Marx's classic is published one of De Leon's brilliant editorials entitled, "Did Marx Err?" De Leon here discusses Marx's condemnation of the Gotha Program and concludes that Marx did *not* err.

The master minds of Marx and De Leon focussed on the same subject is indeed a treat of which no student will hesitate to avail himself.

A special preface has been prepared of which a special feature is a brief consideration of "the dictatorship of the proletariat," to which Marx makes passing reference in his discussion of the Gotha Program.

PRICE 20 CENTS

New York Labor News Co., 45 Rose Street, New York City

The Revolutionary Act

By Frederick Engels

This pamphlet, containing an essay on revolutionary tactics by Frederick Engels, originally written as a preface to a monograph by Karl Marx on the "Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850," is a discussion of the conditions in Europe during the latter half of the nineteenth century, together with the status of the revolutionary movement. It deals particularly with revolutionary tactics and compares the resources, advantages and difficulties of the proletariat as compared with previous revolutions. But most important of all, it balances carefully the revolutionary weapons of the present revolution, and finds the possibilities of military insurrection under ordinary circumstances to be decidedly the weakest weapon in the hands of the modern revolutionary proletariat, as long as political power rests in the hands of its opponents.

Added to the Engels essay is a short statement by Daniel De Leon, an answer to a question regarding the necessity of both the political and industrial revolutionary organizations. Engels has made plain the weakness of military organization and the necessity of political action. De Leon shows that political action itself is not a force, that it requires BACKING. In preparing this backing the worker has to choose between two: military action or industrial organization. De Leon shows here, as he showed repeatedly, that in an industrial country, the backing of the Industrial Union is the logical and by far the most powerful.

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY
45 Rose Street — — New York City

"DANIEL DE LEON"

THE MAN AND HIS WORK

A SYMPOSIUM



Daniel De Leon was a pioneer among men. He was the torch bearer, the carrier of a new idea in a land where the capitalist class had become powerful almost beyond comprehension; where the corroding influences of the capitalist system had devitalized and turned to its own uses such as there was of a labor movement. De Leon battled during his long and useful life against these corrupting and corroding influences, and while fighting, he formulated the tactics needed in the workers' struggle for emancipation.

He formulated the idea of industrial Socialist society, pointing to the purely transitory nature of the political state, emphasizing time and again the pregnant truth that if civilization is to continue in its onward march, the working class of the world must rear the new Republic of Labor, and that the woof and the warp, so to speak, of the new social fabric, must be wrought in accordance with the occupational or industrial mould of present-day society, with an industrial administration, or an Industrial Council, to take the place of the antiquated state machinery. He further emphasized the necessity of the workers' now preparing to build that new society by organizing into industrial unions.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.—In Memoriam, Rudolph Schwab; Reminiscences of Daniel De Leon, Henry Kuhn; Daniel De Leon—Our Comrade, Olive M. Johnson.

BOOK II.—With De Leon Since '89, Rudolph Katz; To His Pen, Chas. H. Ross; Daniel De Leon—The Pilot, F. B. Guarnier; De Leon—Immortal, Sam J. French; Daniel De Leon—An Oration, Ch. H. Corrigan.

347 PAGES. CLOTH \$1.75—PAPER \$1.25
N.Y. Labor News Co., 45 Rose St., New York City

The Socialist Labor Party

A Booklet Relating Its History and Development
Through Four Decades.

By HENRY KUHN and OLIVE M. JOHNSON

Henry Kuhn, National Secretary of the S. L. P. for the greater part of the period when De Leon was at the helm, has written the history of the movement from 1890 to 1905, from which date Olive M. Johnson, Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE, member of the Party since 1895, and intimate associate of De Leon, has taken it up and brought it up to date. The early flounderings, the grasping of a clear aim, the struggle against internal dissension and external corruption, the death of its leader and the period of lethargy following that disaster, and the final emergence of the Socialist Labor Party as a Party not to be swerved by chimeras or pleasing mirages are narrated in a style at once literary and gripping.

A PAMPHLET

THAT EVERY ONE WOULD LIKE TO OWN.

PRICE FIFTY CENTS

New York Labor News Co., 45 Rose St., New York City

Revolutionary Milestones

1890--1930

By *ARNOLD PETERSEN*

A fine illustration of the fact that history can be written as a science and philosophy, and not as a pageant.

Its value lies in its able presentation of the historic material, facts and philosophy upon which the triumph of the Socialist Labor Party is being reared, and the skill with which it conducts the reader in an educational retrospect along the paths trod by the S. L. P. during the forty years of its existence.

Written to commemorate the 40th Anniversary of the S.L.P. by one who has been its National Secretary for nearly two decades, and still occupies that arduous and important advanced post in the Party, this work comes with all the intimate knowledge, experience and authority of one who has played a large part in many of the more recent periods and events signalled here as evidence of the great progress made by the S. L. P. in the clarification and orientation of Revolutionary Socialism in America.

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

New York Labor News Co., 45 Rose Street, New York City

Marxism vs. Anti-Marxism

By *ARNOLD PETERSEN*

Also an Essay on Karl Marx by Daniel De Leon
and an Editorial by Olive M. Johnson

The articles collected in this pamphlet—written primarily for the columns of the WEEKLY PEOPLE—have been given this more permanent form because, as a group, they constitute an excellent demonstration of the use social pests can be put to in the cultivation of the revolutionary Socialist garden. The article on Karl Marx by De Leon—a beautiful dialectic exposition of the class struggle—binds the first article together with the following two as skilfully as if it had actually been written for the purpose and not many years before either of them was penned. Together the four articles form a page in the materialist interpretation of history as it is making before our eyes today—always the most difficult history to interpret.

ILLUSTRATED.

32 LARGE PAGES, WITH STRIKING COVER DESIGN.

Price 20 cents

New York Labor News Co., 45 Rose St., New York City

Virus of Anarchy

Bakuninism vs. Marxism.

By Arnold Petersen and Olive M. Johnson.

Three articles demonstrating the danger to the proletariat, as well as folly and imbecility, of Anarchism in general and Anarcho-Communism in particular, which latter is the twentieth century form of Bakuninism so bitterly fought in the early seventies of the last century by Marx, Engels and other revolutionary Socialist leaders.

PRICE 10 CENTS

ECONOMIC BASIS OF EDUCATION

By A. M. Orange.

With introductory essay by Olive M. Johnson. A stimulating study of the proper function of education and its relation to the economic basis and industrial development.

PRICE 10 CENTS

New York Labor News Co., 45 Rose St., New York City



OFFICIAL ORGAN SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

A revolutionary Socialist journal. Dedicated to the idea that the emancipation of the working class must be the class-conscious work of that class. The WEEKLY PEOPLE teaches that a political victory of the working class is "moonshine" unless the might of the workers in the shape of a revolutionary industrial union is behind that victory. It teaches further that the organization of the working class can not be accomplished by dragging the revolutionary movement into the rat-holes of anarchists and "pure and simple" physical forceists generally. The WEEKLY PEOPLE ruthlessly exposes the scheming "pure and simple" politician as well as the "pure and simple" physical forceist. In doing this it at the same time imparts sound information regarding Marxian or scientific Socialism. It is a journal which, read a few times, becomes indispensable.

Subscription rates: One year, \$2; six months, \$1; three months, .50 cents; trial subscription, 25 cents. Bundle rates supplied on request.

Weekly People, 45 Rose St., New York City.

